

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/020,484	RIST, JAMES	

All Participants:

Status of Application: allowed

(1) Matthew D. Hoel, examiner.

(3) _____.

(2) Jeffrey Huter, attorney.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 26 October 2009

Time: P.M.

Type of Interview:

- Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description: .

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

NF, 02-03-2009.

Claims discussed:

19-25,27,30,31.

Prior art documents discussed:

Hand (2002/0125627 A1); Winters (60/337,409); Paulsen (7,390,257 B2); Bell (6,722,487 B1); Chase (4,291,294 A).

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/M. D. H./
 Examiner, Art Unit 3714

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Upon reviewing the case, the examiner believed that Paras. 41-44 of the specification (2003/0109302 A1) discussing the determination of the rejection rate was the most significant passage relating as to what the claims as a whole were trying to do. No mention in the closest prior art, cited above, is made of tying this rejection rate to a malfunction for the machine. Mr. Huter subsequently e-mailed proposed amendments along these lines for entry by examiner's amendment. On 11-04-2009, the examiner received verbal permission to change "rating" in claims 21, 22, 23, and 27 to "rate" for more consistent terminology, and to change claim 22's dependency from 21 to 19, and 23's dependency from 22 to 19, as 21, 22, and 23 are separate dependent claims specifying different ranges..